TOP SECRET [redacted]

(S) NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

June 23, 1971

Dear Dick,

I have just finished reading a speech presented by Senator Humphrey on the Space Program which was inserted in the June 18 Congressional Record by Representative Teague. In the speech, Senator Humphrey openly acknowledges and discusses the Satellite Reconnaissance Program. I believe that this speech could lead to some very undesirable consequences. Other knowledgeable people who become familiar with this speech may feel that it is acceptable to discuss the Satellite Reconnaissance Program in the public domain. I also feel that those who maintain a speculative interest in our activities may use this speech as a basis for undesirable publicity. Although he is inaccurate in his details, he discusses our ability to take extremely good pictures, a subject which we consider to be especially sensitive.

I feel that continued exposure of this nature may inhibit operations and could be provocative in view of Senator Humphrey's present and former positions and prestige. I believe it is appropriate to use your good offices to inform Senator Humphrey of the current national policy regarding Satellite Reconnaissance and to minimize the impact of this breach.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

1 Attachment
Congressional Record Excerpt

The Honorable Richard Helms
Director of Central Intelligence
Washington, D. C.

[redacted]

TOP SECRET

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC DOWNGRADING AND DECLASSIFICATION DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

1d6-23-692

[redacted] 2925-71

COPY 1 OF 2 COPY

PAGE ____ OF ____ PAGES

SAFLL file

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1971 No. 9

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Depart from evil and do good: Seek peace and pursue it.—Psalm 34: 14.

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, we bow our heads and open our hearts as we stand in Thy presence.

"Without Thee we are weak and frail
Stay Thou near by:
Temptations lose their power
When Thou are nigh."

As we pray, may Thy spirit take possession of our minds and hearts, leading us to genuine solutions for the problems that face us both as individuals and as a nation. May ill will, injustice, and hostility come to an end, and may good will, justice, and peace arise to new life in us and in our world.

In the manner and manners of the Master of Men we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of nonexempt claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS URGES THE PRESIDENT TO SIGN THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

(Mr. McFALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate last Tuesday on the accelerated public works legislation, S. 575, my floor statement was not complete and did not include a list of witnesses heard by the Public Works Committee when the legislation was identified as H.R. 5376. This list was inadvertently omitted but did appear in the June 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the Extensions of Remarks section.

Last Wednesday, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, assembled in Philadelphia, urged the President to sign the accelerated public works legislation now on his desk for signature. I am glad to include at this point of the RECORD a copy of the U.S. Conference of Mayors' resolution:

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

Whereas, unemployment is at its highest levels in nearly a decade; and

Whereas, because of the local financial crisis many cities are unable to construct urgently needed public works facilities; and

Whereas, the Congress has passed the Accelerated Public Works Act to provide $2 billion to aid local localities in areas of high unemployment construct needed public works facilities; and

Whereas, the Accelerated Public Works Act in combination with the public service employment legislation will aid significantly in solving unemployment problems and upgrading the quality of municipal services, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors urges the President to sign the Accelerated Public Works Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Conference urges the Administration and the Congress to appropriate and commit to local projects the full $2 billion in assistance authorized in the Accelerated Public Works Act.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, when I offered my cosponsorship to the newsman's privilege bill of 1971, H.R. 9027, I noted that the better part of my adult life has been spent in the pursuit of law and journalism.

I am, therefore, especially sensitive to any encroachment on the freedom of the press, which I consider vital to a free society. The Government cannot tamper with the freedom of the press without tampering with the right of the public to information essential for the operation of a democratic society.

Without touching here on the complex historical and legal consideration involved in the recent Justice Department action with regard to the New York Times, I would here affirm my conviction that encroachment on freedom of the press can only be viewed as a prelude to the denial of other basic constitutional freedoms.

This latest action by the Justice Department comes as its second serious error of this year. When the veterans of the Vietnam conflict came to this city the Justice Department rushed to court to request an injunction against them and 2 days later went back to court to withdraw that request. I believe this is alarming evidence of basic unsound policy, of jittery guardians of justice.

I, therefore, urge you, Mr. Speaker, to join with the majority leader of the other body in launching full-scale congressional hearings on the New York Times issue and the executive policy of classification of documents in general. Nothing less than the right of free expression in America is at stake here.

THE MERCHANT MARINE AND GRAIN PRODUCERS MUST REALIZE THEIR MAXIMUM VALUE TO SOCIETY

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, by eliminating the requirement that U.S.-flag vessels carry at least [illegible] percent of the grain to Communist China another blow has been struck for the foreign and runaway shippers who would like to see the U.S. flag disappear from the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let this happen. We must build up our merchant marine, which presently carries less than 5 percent of our foreign commerce.

Besides being in the interest of our national defense, it is in our economic

agencies are under no compulsion to integrate our recommendations into the project design nor are our objections overriding under existing procedures.

What is clearly called for is a reallocation of agency priorities. The Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency should be given a much stronger and more meaningful voice in the development of project design.

It is time that the Congress gave the environmental agencies the leadership role in determining project design. Make us a leader rather than a frustrated follower. A large portion of the morale problem within my Department is the result of rarely being listened to when we offer relevant recommendations to other agencies on this problem. It is discouraging for our biologists and field personnel to stand by helplessly and watch the wetlands resource succumb to the dredge bit or dragline bucket with little or no regard for the natural system.

And now to the third question I posed in my opening remarks . . . Should some sort of moratorium be placed on stream channelization activities at the present time?

In answering this question I must first tell you quite frankly that it has been the observation of the majority of our personnel that those agencies engaged in stream channelization activities are still largely paying nothing more than lip service to earnest environmental protection. We have yet to detect any substantive departure from the practices of yesteryear by these agencies, and I believe the record will clearly support these conclusions.

In view of our continuing problems in this vital area, it is my belief that the following items should be given careful consideration as means to further protect these rapidly vanishing wetland systems:

1. A complete review of all river and stream channelization projects should be initiated by the Council on Environmental Quality working in cooperation with the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency. This review should be directed to the possible need for project redesign or project deauthorization. If the supporting agencies fail to take this review seriously and if nothing more than lip service is paid to redesigning these projects then I would welcome the opportunity to reappear before this Committee to discuss the imposition of a complete moratorium on all such projects until these reviews and necessary project revisions have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing comments of Mr. Reed dramatically demonstrate that channelization often has severe adverse environmental effects. During the subsequent colloquy, I asked Mr. Reed to tell us whether or not he supported the recommendations of the dozen environmental organizations and others that the moratorium which SCS has imposed earlier this year be continued through fiscal year 1972. Our colloquy follows:

Mr. Reuss. At our hearings last month, at which 12 of the major environmental organizations of the country were present, they all without exception agreed that in view of the environmental damage caused by the stream channelization projects of the Soil Conservation Service, that the current self-imposed moratorium on continued channelization work of the Soil Conservation Service should be continued throughout the next fiscal year, starting on July 1, in the appropriations act, which of course would permit it to be revived under supplemental appropriations legislation at such time as the environmental procedural questions had been worked out so that we are no longer in this lip service situation that we have been in. Would you agree with the positions of those organizations?

Mr. Reed. I was unaware of their stand, sir.

Yes, I would support that. Unless real consideration is given, with a fresh start on estimation of many of the environmental projects—not many, all of these projects—I think it is inconceivable, with all the interest in the Congress and in the United States as a whole, we would go ahead under the same old ballgame as we have been doing all these years. We know what the track record is. The bear tracks all come right back and are easily followed. And yet we do not seem to be able to attract anybody's attention at the planning agencies before they initiate these projects.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY ADDRESSES SPACE SEMINAR OF THE HUGH O'BRIAN YOUTH FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Teague) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the text of an address which the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, U.S. Senator from Minnesota, delivered to approximately 70 high-school-age boys concerning the merits and benefits of our space program:

Talk by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to NASA-Hugh O'Brian Seminar, Launch Control Center, June 14, 1971

Thank you. Thank you, very much. It's a great pleasure to be introduced by a famous actor and a man of the stage and screen like Hugh O'Brian. I always felt, myself, that I should have been in the movies but, somehow or another, I never made it. I want to compliment Hugh on the Hugh O'Brian Foundation For Youth and compliment him particularly because of what I see ahead of me here right out in front, you young men. And I want to thank the National Association of Student Councils, the Principals, the NASA organization and others who have made this Space Seminar possible.

I'm going to get right down to the nitty gritty of what I've got to say to you and then, I understand, we might have a little question period and I'll, hopefully, come up with at least some attempts at answers.

I think the first question that comes to mind whenever you think of a program such as the Space Program and think of the times in which we live and the problems which our country faces, which you are well aware of, the needs of our poor, the needs of all the people in this country in health and education, I think we have to ask ourselves, "Why do we spend money on Space?".

I just left Philadelphia this morning. Hugh and the group picked me up at Philadelphia after I had addressed the United States Conference of Mayors. I've been the Mayor of a great city, the city of Minneapolis, Minnesota, I've been a United States Senator during very difficult periods of American life, I've been the Vice President of the United States and I even thought I'd like to move into a place where they gave you free rent over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. But I missed that by a little bit. It was sort of a space shot that went off target. So, I came back to the launching platform or, back to Earth called the United States Senate.

I would like to visit with you on why I think this program's worthwhile. Let me say, first of all, that I've been a man that spent most of my life trying to figure out how we could help people who needed help. How we could get housing for people of low income and moderate income; how we could get Federal aid to education; how we could get more money for our parks and playgrounds for a Youth Employment Program. I was chairman, for four years, of the Youth Opportunity Program. I came into political life fighting the battle of Civil Rights, trying to open up opportunity for people of all walks of life, of every race, creed and nationality. Because I happen to believe that this country of ours is the greatest experiment of all. It's greater than any space experiment. The United States of America, an experiment as to whether or not people such as in this room, and I look here and see every race, creed and nationality, whether we as a people can live together in peace and harmony and progress. Let me tell you that it's never been done before.

Just like the first landing on the Moon; never been done before. Never in the history of the world have the people of such variety as we have in this country ever been able to live in freedom and peace, in all of recorded history. Now, you say, "I can't believe that. People live in peace in Sweden." Yes, but they're all Swedes, with few exceptions. There may be a Finlander or two in there. There's a fellow here from Duluth. We've got a lot of Finlanders up there around Duluth. People in Norway live in peace but they're all Norwegians. People in Japan live in peace but they're most all Japanese. This is a heterogeneous, to use a big word, pluralistic society from every race, creed and nationality, every culture and I want to repeat to you as a teacher, not as a politician, I just spent two years in the classroom at the university as a teacher and I've spent a lot of other years teaching, my work is in the field of History and Political Science, no country in all of recorded history has ever been able to do what's happening in this room right now, to have a white man and a black man or a brown man and a red man and a yellow man sitting alongside of each other in peace and harmony. It's never been done. And we're not quite sure that we're going to make it. That's the question before the house. Can we make it? Can we resolve our problems out of reason rather than out of force? Can we think through things rather than fighting them through? Can we preserve institutions of representative government where we make selections through elections rather than through connivery, conspiracy, slaughter and brute force? If we can, we'll be the first. We've come a long ways. You've seen that ad they have on the television of the Virginia Slims. That was for the girls. We've come a long ways, girls. Well, we've come a long ways, fellows. We've come a long ways in this country but we haven't arrived at our destination. We're still exploring. So that's the big question before the country. All the other questions are on the periphery. They're all related somewhat.

One of the reasons that I have been active in the Space Program is because I believe that this program did something for all the things I thought were important in life. First of all, I think everybody ought to have a challenge. I think everybody ought to explore. And I think everybody ought to dare. And space requires all of that. Space exploration. Of course, so do other things. You don't have to be out in outer space to explore. After all, Columbus explored and he was just on the ocean. We've had other explorers who went over the hills and over the mountains. And you can explore in a thousand and one fields from education to athletics. But there is a great challenge here. But, more importantly, I think the Space

Program relates directly to what you and I are interested in.

For example, most of you in this room have taken a keen interest in what we call Ecology. Do you realize that word had almost been lost to the English language up until the last six or seven years? I venture to say that if you go to the library and ask the librarian to take a look back to six years ago and see how many times the word Ecology appeared in the metropolitan press that it would not have appeared once in a thousand editions. Six years ago. Ten years ago, practically unheard of except amongst the professors, the academics. Now, it's in every article, practically. We talk Ecology, environment. When do you think we made the great breakthrough in discovery about environment? When a man got in a space capsule and got up there in space and looked down and saw this Earth of ours and said, "It's blanketed in smog and filth and dirt." The Space Program was the pioneer in beginning to make the discovery in environmental control. And it's only beginning. One thing the Space Program has done is to prove that you can live in a pure environment. The men who live in a space capsule have to live in a pure environment. It's also proven to us that there's a relationship between the living space that we have and the number of people that can be there. It's also proven to us that you can have clean water and clean air. And it's proven to us that you can work together. So the Space Program has given us some rather practical examples.

The computer, they say, has revolutionized American industry. And, not only industry, but education. It's just in its infancy. And the computer is a direct by-product of the Space Program. It has tremendously increased the technical capabilities of modern industry and science. The telecommunications industry and, by the way ten years, fifteen years from now this same group, or a group like yours will be able to have a telecommunications lecture out of a space satellite that will have its own power station included within it and be able to bring you lectures on television from every country, practically, in the world. They say that it's fifteen years from a successful experiment in a laboratory to a practical application in what we call the real world. It is now possible, by laboratory, to lecture. We know, we watched the Olympics broadcast on the space satellite, communication satellite. But now, what I'm talking to you about is a man in Tokyo at the University of Tokyo giving you a lecture on Japanese Government and there's an instantaneous translation of that lecture into your classroom by mechanical translation, not by the human voice. Mechanically. It's on its way. Where you will be able to get the best minds of the world. Not that you have to hire them to bring them to your classroom but you plug in and turn the dial and turn on the switch, turn on the closed circuit television and there he is speaking in Russian or Japanese or Hindi, whatever it may be and instantaneous translation into your language to explain to you what his message is. The Space Program is making this possible. Not only ours but the Russians' and space research all over the world. This is in the offing for us.

One other part of the Space Program that often goes unnoticed is what it does for health. We've learned more about the stress and strain and tension and what the human body can take and how it reacts to weightlessness, for example, to different strains and pressures under the space program of Space Medicine, it's called, than ever before in medical history. This means lives saved. It surely means a great deal in the kind of a life we lead today, a very busy, urbanized life.

The Space Program is going to do something else that's quite interesting for us and it's right now doing it. For example, we have what we call an Earth Resources Satellite. I imagine that somebody may have told you about it. This is one of the interests that I had when I was Chairman of the Space Council. Our Earth Resources Satellite is able to discover, a satellite in outer space taking pictures of the Earth or using different kinds of science and technology that we have, the ultra-violet ray and so on, able to detect plant disease. Able to detect underground rivers. Able to detect underground lakes. Able to detect underground oil deposits. It used to be said that the fisherman went to sea and cast his nets in the hope of catching fish. Today, an Earth Resources Satellite detects where the fish are and the boats go on out to where the fish are. The Earth Resources Satellite has unlimited possibilities. Unlimited possibilities. The largest gold mine in the United States was discovered at Carlshad, Nevada, by an Earth Resources Satellite. However, this one was attached to a high altitude plane like a U-2. You used to see the picture of the fellow with his little donkey and his pickax and his shovel and the guy's out there chopping away into the side of a mountain and hoping he's going to find gold or silver. The largest gold mine in the United States of America was discovered without a fellow using a pick or an ax or a donkey. He had an Earth Resources Satellite to pierce down through the Earth and it said, "There's gold." This is just a beginning. And this is in its infancy. I'm only trying to show you that these are experiments. But, they're beginning now to produce results.

The weather satellite, Project Nimbus. Project Nimbus has, alone, saved more money in property than the total cost of the Space Program. So when people talk about the cost of the Space Program, the best investment—if we'd never done anything, forget Walter Cunningham over here in Apollo 7, forget the men in all the other Apollo flights and the Gemini flights, just say that's the dramatics of it. I don't happen to think it is but if you want to be cynical just say that that was just to keep the people interested—the weather satellite has saved lives by the thousands by advanced warning and it has saved billions of dollars in property. And, actually, the cost of the Space Program could well have been paid for by the savings that have been made by this one breakthrough. And, needless to say, the communication satellite has literally revolutionized communication. And you and I know as we talk we're all the time saying "Well, we've got to learn how to communicate". Well, not only do we have to learn how to communicate but we've got to learn as Americans to learn how to communicate with Russians and with Chinese and with Indians and with Japanese and so on and with Nigerians. And the space communications satellite has made it not only possible for us not only to communicate the voice but the picture and to communicate the active body to make things come alive. The weather satellite, now here's the one that means more to me than anything else. I think this generation of young Americans wants to live in peace. The greatest single threat to peace is the Arms Race. And, of course, the Space Program has made possible a great development of what we call the great boosters like the Saturn. And the Russians have their boosters. And it's on these boosters that we put the nuclear warhead. And the nuclear warhead of the megaton of the ten megaton like the Soviet SS 9 or our Minuteman, this is all part of the development of the military aspects of the Space Program. And, on that basis, somebody could say it's a killer. If we'd never had it we'd been better off. But the interesting thing is that the same program that produced the booster, that made possible putting an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile from one country to another, that that same Space Program produced what we call Project Vela.

Project Vela makes it possible for us t detect testing of nuclear weapons by th Soviet Union or any other country. Our spac reconnaissance satellites that take million of pictures—and I have seen them and don't think it's any breach of security to tel you that I have seen pictures taken in th Soviet Union years ago when we thought th Soviet Union did not have Polaris subma rines. And I saw the shipyards in which th Soviet Polaris submarines were being buil And the picture was so accurate that w could tell how many tubes the submarine had. And that reconnaissance satellite wa hundreds of miles in outer space. I've see reconnaissance satellite pictures that wer so accurate that you could read the licens plate on jeeps in foreign countries. Recon naissance satellite pictures of the areas i China where they had their space station and where they tested their nuclear weapons I submit that the Space Program hav pos sibly done more to give us what we call som protection for peace than anything. For ex ample, frequently when we try to negotiat as we are today with the Russians a treat on the banning the ABM, anti-ballistic mis sile, or slowing down the arms race, we call i the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks. righ away somebody comes and says "How ca you trust those Russians?". Well, they think "How can they trust us?" But, let's take ou argument, how can you trust the Russians We don't need to trust them. That's ol fashioned in international diplomacy. W have built an alternative to trust. And the alternative to trust is a satellite system. space system of monitoring. We can tak pictures. We can take testings. We can no only take pictures, for example, of space in stallations and of military installations, bu we have a system where we can not only tel what they have tested or when they hav tested but what they have tested, how bi they have tested it, how big it is and of it chemical composition. Not bad. It's all com out of this program. So I submit that possi bly one of the greatest efforts for world peac has come right out of the science and tech nology of space research.

I think I saw an example of what thi Space Program means. You maybe noted a late that the Russians have been much mor cooperative with the United States. I don' want to attribute this to any one thing. I' spent twenty some years studying Soviet pol icy. It was one of my courses of study whe I was a professor. I helped negotiate th Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I went to Moscow when it was signed. I have the pen tha President Kennedy used to sign the treat and he gave it to me and when he did h said, "I give you this pen, Hubert, becaus it's your treaty." I've spent more time wit Russian leaders than any living American That's a bold statement but it's a fact. Wit Mr. Khrushchev, with Mr. Mikoyan, with Mr Kosygin—these are people that I have gotte to know. I've been with their great new agencies, the Pravda and the Izvestia an the Tass. And when the space shot with Neil Armstrong, our Moon shot took place, timed a visit to the Soviet Union to be i Moscow on the day that that space launc took place from this very Center. And I wa in the offices of Pravda and Izvestia, one th Communist paper and the other the offici state paper, daily newspapers, and a dispatc came through from Reuters, the English new service, noting that the launch had bee successful, and I had said to the editors Pravda, "Why don't you run this as a head line?" There was nothing in their paper tha indicated that our launch had taken place And when I went to Izvestia the same after noon I said, "Look, the launch has taken place and I see nothing in your headlines i your papers." I'm happy to tell you that the were somewhat embarrassed and the nex morning, at the National Hotel, under m door was a copy of Pravda and Izvestia wit front page stories saying that there ha

been a successful launch. I waited in Moscow these days until our boys had completed their exercise and their great trip to the Moon and when Neil Armstrong touched down that Sunday night, it was Sunday night when I was in Moscow. I don't know what the night was here, the only information that I was able to get was out of the Voice of America through the United States Embassy because the Russians had blacked out. They were one of the few countries that did not have live television of that great space shot and of that great dramatic moment. I think it was the Soviet Union, China, and Albania. I believe, two or three countries that refused to cover it live. In Poland and East Germany and Czechoslovakia and in Rumania and in Yugoslavia there were great screens on the street and people were watching it. It was a tremendous thing across the world. But, in Russia, they were playing it down. You may recall they had an unmanned space vehicle that they were trying to get on the Moon at the same time. It went afoul. It didn't work. I'm sure that they were trying to prove to us that they could get there first even if it was without men.

I was in my hotel room at the National Hotel that Sunday night with an open telephone to our embassy reporting back to the hundreds of people that had gathered in our suite from all over the world, giving them a blow by blow account as Neil Armstrong walked down that ladder and put his foot on the Moon's surface. And a great cheer went up from these people. The next morning, I had an appointment with Kosygin, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union at 10:00 in the Kremlin. There had been no notice on the Soviet television or radio as to the success of that Moon shot. And when I arrived at the Kremlin that morning, of course by then the Soviet Union had to acknowledge it and there had been in the morning broadcast, before the arrival at 10:00 an announcement that the Moon shot had been a success without any details. When I arrived at the Kremlin and had my better than three hour visit with Mr. Kosygin, he complimented the United States of America, he complimented our astronauts, he complimented our Space Program and he asked me to convey to our astronauts, through the Houston Space Center, the congratulations of the people of the Soviet Union, which I did. I brought that through our ambassador and it was communicated directly to the men on the Moon and in the space shot and the Kremlin.

Now, why do I tell you that? Because I think that one thing did something great for the world. The Russians, remember, were in competition with us. They said they were going to get there first. They didn't believe that we had the stick-to-itiveness because we're a kind of a jump-around people. We start something and we're not sure if we want to finish it. We get all hot and bothered and then we cool off. And they were pouring in vast resources into their Space Program, tremendous resources, under great secrecy. And, you may recall when President Kennedy said in 1961 that we would put a man on the Moon and bring him back safely to Earth within the decade of the '60s. Most people believed that we weren't going to be able to do it. And we did it ahead of schedule at less than we had contemplated in cost. And what did this mean to the Russians? Because the Russians understand power. The Russians understand, the Communists, the Soviets, understand organization. They understand science and technology. They pour billions of dollars into it and they're good. Don't misunderstand me. And the Russians understand the meaning of all of this. When we were able to succeed they said, and it went through their mind like through a computer, they said, "They did it. They mobilized the resources, the manpower, the plan, they had a commitment, they stuck to it and they succeeded". Which was just a simple way of telling the Russians that if these Americans make up their mind to do something, they may do it. And, they can do it. It told them something about our management, about our labor skills. It told them something about our resource ability. And it told them something about the dimensions of power. And, from that day on, the relationships with the Soviet Union have been decidedly better, all for the future hope of mankind. Because the peace of the world in your lifetime and in the balance of mine depends in a large measure on how we get along with the Russians. Not that we give in to them. But that we're able to find areas that are mutually beneficial where we can come to some arrangement. Because this man speaking to you, serving on the National Security Council, as I did, can tell you that we have enough atomic power in any one of our sections of our nuclear weaponry, to destroy the whole of mankind. The Russians and ourselves are capable of total destruction. They can destroy us and we can destroy them. And we can take a small fraction of what we have in nuclear weapons today and destroy over 30% of the entire population of the Soviet Union. They can do exactly the same to us so don't start pulling up. Neither one of us can win it. In other words, it is what we call a balance of terror, mutual deterrence. The Soviets understand it and we understand it. And what they understood more out of the Space Program than anything else was that we knew how to organize, to mobilize, to make a commitment and to follow through. And from that day on we've had a better relationship. And I predict that if we stick with it that you're going to have a chance to live in peace because, despite all the tragedies of the present war and pray God that's over promptly and I mean promptly, the great threat is between the Soviet Union and the United States. And, in the days ahead, it could be between mainland China. But, thank goodness, we're now beginning to act civilized about that and beginning to open up contacts.

I'll just leave you with one little suggestion. I remember when Apollo 13 got into trouble. You know, we're all so proud of this wonderful program. It's been a kind of an emotement for us at a time when there's been so many troubles, so many mistakes and so many decisions that didn't seem to come out right, it was kind of good just to have one or two that seemed to work. It was a great uplift just out of the success of space programs and particularly of the manned flights. Well, when Jim Lovell and Jack Swigert and Fred Haise took off in Apollo 13, I remember they said it was a perfect launch. Just perfect. And everything was going great. And then, one noon, as I recall, I think it was sometime in the mid-day, there was a flash that something had gone wrong. And a terrible feeling came over America. And what was that feeling? That these fellows might never get back. Oh, we'd always felt that that might happen. But we never wanted to believe it. We'd had another tragedy in the Space Program and that was when, in one of the tests down here, on the ground there had been a terrible explosion and you may recall it. White, Grissom and Chaffee, two of them I knew very well, perished in that unbelievably tragic explosion. But it appeared that it was going to happen again. And then what happened? Then the whole resources of this program came into being. And I use this as an example for you. It's like our Earth. Our Earth is our satellite. You're on a space satellite now, called Earth. That's why you're space men. We're all space children. We're a part of the Solar System. We're a part of a big family. And if there was no other reason to have the program than to know the rest of the family called the Solar System, we ought to have it. We ought to learn more about the Sun. We ought to learn more about the effect of other planets on our lives. Obviously, it has some effect. People have known for a long time that Sun Spots had some effect on our psychic reactions, upon plant life, upon weather. We know so little. We have just scratched the surface.

Well, Apollo 13 was, again, another part of the Earth's great study of our Solar System. And it went wrong. And there was all across this land a feeling that these men would never come back. Horrendous stories were told. They'll burn out in space. What will be their last words? Who will be the last one to communicate? And we worried about their families. The uncertainty of it all. But, yet, almost the certainty that they'd never made it. And then, they made it. And I'll tell you why. And it relates to our kind of thing. They made it because, first of all, they had confidence in themselves and they had confidence because they were trained and equipped. They had confidence in the equipment even though much of it had failed them. They also took a little look to the past and learned from that because there was a man on the ground at Houston who was talking to the boys up there that was one of the other astronauts who was giving them the benefit of his earlier experiences from 7, 8, 11 and other flights. And they were doing everything that they could as a team to bring this space satellite back to Earth. Now, young friends, it's like our space satellite. I've heard a lot of young people say that the system is no good, speaking of our social-political system. Sure, it's got a lot of mistakes. And so they say the thing to do is to blow it up. Well, that isn't what the astronauts did and, let me tell you, their system was in trouble. They were in serious trouble. They were losing their power. They were losing their control, for a period of time, of the very mechanism in which the safety of their lives depended. But Jim Lovell didn't say, "Why those lousy engineers down there that put this confounded contraption together, we ought to go after them and when we get back we'll murder them." He didn't say that. The first thing he said is, "Look, fellows, we're in a fix. Let's see if we can all do our part. Let's not consume too much of our consumables. There's only so much water here." There's only so much here on this Earth, too. "There's only so much fresh air." There's only so much here. Let's not pollute it. "There's only so much power, we've got to conserve it." And we sometimes are in the same condition here. So, here was their world. There were only three men in that world out there called Apollo 13. And there are three billion on our Apollo called Earth. But the three out there decided that they were going to work together. They said we all have something to contribute. They weren't of the same religion or of the same race. Or the same background. But they said, "Look, we can pull together." And they said, "Not only that, we have only so much to deal with, let's conserve it." If they'd have had five men abroad they wouldn't have made it. So there is such a thing as overpopulation. There was enough for three. And they had something else. They didn't say, "Oh, we don't care what the rest of the people have done in the past," as I have heard some young friends say. They say, "What do we care about the yesterdays? It's unimportant." Oh, no. They called back to Houston and they said, "Say, we're in some trouble up here. Did you ever have anything like this go wrong before?" Whoever was down at Houston, they were communicating past experiences. The former astronauts who had been up on these Moon flights said, "Here's the way it worked with us. Try this, try that. Here's our experience." They drew from experience and then they drew from their own sense and their own knowledge.

And they put together what they knew, what others had tried and what they'd experienced and to make a long story, which could have been a tragic story, short they were able to bring it back to Earth safely.

And out of that we've learned a great deal. We've made a better machine. I'm only saying to you, young friends, that out of the mistakes we've made, out of misjudgements, out of the pollution of the atmosphere which we have created, out of wars which we've been involved in, out of social blunders which we've had, such as racism in this country, we're learning if we don't decide to destroy the machine. If we just simply say, "Look, it's all we've got." It's just this Earth satellite. That's the only one we have. You can't step the world and get off. Sorrown. You really can't. There isn't enough room to even get on one of these other satellites. Very few of you are going to make it. You ought to stick with it here.

So I think there are some great lessons in the Space Program. That's why I wanted to come here today. When Hugh asked me if I'd come down I said I would. Because I think this is the age that belongs to you. It's the age, the say, of Aquarius. Not it's the age of Space. Exploration. Now, take this same exploratory feeling you have into a thousand and one other areas of life. Can we build more and better homes that people can live in? Can we make neighborhoods safe? Can we make cities livable? Can we stop polluting the waters and the air? Can we breathe the air? Can we learn how to live in a community of nations? Are we going to learn more about the entire Universe? Because the Universe has untold secrets and the Solar System has secrets that we need to know. If I were a young man today of your age I would want to spend some time learning about the Sun. Learning about the planets. Because I'm just as convinced that your generation is going to have to know about the Sun as the generation of Christopher Columbus had to know about the new world. I think we're going to have to learn a great deal about the effects of a neighborhood that's bigger than our town or our state or even our world. The neighborhood of the Cosmos. And that's your world now. New frontiers.

So that's my little message to you. And, gee, what a time to be alive. I envy you. But I don't want you to think I'm resigning. I told somebody the other day that I was starting to take Geritol. I want to live to the year 2000. I want to see Number One, whether you're going to repair all of the damage that you think your parents have made. I want to see whether you're as smart as we think you are. Because, you see, I've got a big stake in you. After all, you're going to be responsible for my Medicare and my Social Security and I've got to make sure that you're going to do a good job. But more importantly, I want to see what's going to happen in this world in the next thirty years. Imagine. Look what's happened in the last ten. Look what's happened in the last twenty. In fact, in the last twenty years, television. That's all. There were no political conventions televised until the convention of 1952. Even Kennedy wasn't on. It's all happened in your lifetime. Now, what do you think is going to happen in the next twenty-five to thirty years? I don't know but I'm sure going to do everything I can to find out. In the meantime, I'll turn it over to you. Thank you, very much.

AIRBORNE RUSSIAN ROULETTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago a United Airlines passenger plane collided with an Air Force F-100, and 47 passengers were killed.

One month after that, on May 20, 1958, an Air Force T-33 collided with a Capitol Airlines Viscount, killing 11 passengers and one of the occupants of the T-33.

The Nation was shocked. It seemed that military aircraft and airliners were falling out of the sky everywhere, and for one shocking reason: The pilots could not see and avoid each other. Airplanes had become so fast that it was no longer possible for pilots to be expected to see each other, even in clear weather, soon enough to avoid collisions.

The Nation demanded answers. The answer, we were told, was to integrate military and civilian traffic control so that all airplanes in the air over a given place would be controlled by a single ground traffic director. Congress was told in July 1958, that arrangements would be made to exchange information between the military and civilian traffic control systems, so that collisions could be avoided.

Despite the promises, however, airborne Russian roulette is still very much with us. Only a few days ago a DC-9 of Air West collided with a Marine F-4 Phantom, and 49 passengers were killed, plus the pilot of the Phantom. It was almost a carbon copy of the accident 13 years ago at Las Vegas, right down to the number of people killed.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that mid-air collisions are a very real danger today. Air traffic control is still a very uncertain thing. There are reasons for this, and I think Congress ought to be aware of the dangers, and why they exist.

In the first place, the FAA has never really integrated military and civilian air traffic control. In the tragic crash a few days ago, the FAA claims that its radars did not see the planes, because of interference from nearby mountains. The truth is that the Marine plane was on visual flight rules and not really under positive ground control. This should not have happened, and would not have happened if the FAA controlled traffic in the way that it assured us a dozen years ago that it would and could.

But of course collisions are possible between any two planes, regardless of whether they are military or civilian. Collisions do happen, and all too often the cause is failure in the air traffic control system.

In the most recent case, out in California, we are told that the traffic control radars had interference from mountains, and so failed to locate the aircraft that collided. In other cases we have been told that the radars were obscured by weather returns, or some other odd factor. The truth is that the system is simply not adequate.

The air route traffic control system is superimposed on an old system that relied on people simply seeing each other and thus avoiding collision. In fact, they called it "see and avoid." That worked well enough when airplanes traveled slowly, but today you have closing rates approaching a thousand miles an hour. Today's planes, traveling headon, are a speck on the windshield at one instant, and are on each other the next; avoidance is just not possible at such high rates of speed. Therefore you have to have positive control from the ground. That is why we have the air route traffic control system.

This system, however, being superimposed on the old "see and avoid" system is in fact no system at all. The equipment available is all too often outmoded and under-maintained. That is why we hear such frequent pleas about planes never being seen on the radars that are supposed to control them.

Moreover, the network is overloaded. Controllers are asked to undertake impossible workloads, and mistakes do happen. Not long ago two controllers standing side by side guided a light plane and a helicopter into collision. The reason was that the local system was illogically arranged. Procedures have since been changed, but who knows how many other places there may be where controllers standing side by side may be responsible for the same airspace, neither knowing what the other is controlling? This may be what happens in all too many collisions.

Sometimes the equipment is faulty, sometimes the procedures are inadequate or just plain wrong, and other times controllers are overworked, and every time this happens—or any one of these things happens—there is potential for disaster.

But there is more to this airborne Russian roulette than merely antiquated equipment or wrong procedures or human frailties. Sometimes the equipment just is not there, as happened at Hartford only a few days ago, when 28 people lost their lives in the crash of an Allegheny airliner attempting to land in fog.

Hartford was known as one of the worst airports in the country for various reasons, but one of those was that Hartford had inadequate instrument landing equipment. FAA never attempted to restrict flying there on that account, so as to force local officials to solve the problem, as far as I know. So Allegheny lost another plane, and 28 people are dead, because the equipment that should have been there was not.

The same could be said of Huntington, W. Va., location of another recent tragedy. The equipment needed for landing by instruments was not adequate. Pilots identified Huntington as one of the 10 worst airports in the country, just as they had Hartford. And just as at Hartford the almost inevitable happened—bad weather, inadequate instruments, and a shortfall. Many were killed.

Why is the equipment not there? Why is it antiquated? Why are there all these faults?

It could be that the FAA has never pressed its own case, because it is afraid to confess its own weaknesses and failings. Maybe they do not want to frighten the public.

On the other hand it is possible that the FAA has been more interested in political fences than in air safety.

Not many years ago the FAA decided that San Antonio would be a good place for a major air traffic control facility. They brought in the latest equipment, brought in highly trained people, and opened up a specially constructed, brand new facility. Then a couple of years later they closed it down and moved it to Houston. There were political reasons for this, which no longer exist, but a